

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 14, 2006 (“the 2/14/2006 Office Action”), claims 1-3, 6, 7, 16-18, 21, 22, 31-33, 36, 37, 46-48, 51, and 52 are currently amended; no claims are newly added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-60 are currently pending in the application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants’ representative in the telephonic interview of May 10, 2006. The preceding amendments, and the following remarks are based on the substance of that discussion. For example, the Examiner agreed to consider the claim amendments made above without asserting the previously made Election of Species requirement. Further, the Examiner suggested amendments to the claims that would provisionally overcome the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9-16, 24-31, 39-46, and 54-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based on the amendments above, this rejection has been obviated.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Rejection based on “Vivacqua”

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9, 13, 15, 16, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 54, 55, 58, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by “Agents to Assist in Finding Help” (citation omitted), by Vivacqua *et al.* (“Vivacqua”). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 to further clarify various aspects of the invention. Based in part on these amendments, as well as for features present in the independent claims prior to the amendments of this paper, Applicants traverse these rejections as being improper at least because Vivacqua does not disclose all of the features of the claimed invention.

For example, claim 1 recites, inter alia, “*maintaining a record of a number of times that actions are performed on the at least one object by the at least one user and a record of action types of the actions performed on the at least one object by the at least one user,*

wherein the types of the actions comprise an authoring action type, a response action type, a linking action type, and an editing action type, and wherein the record is maintained in meta data associated with the at least one object[, and] associating a value with each of the action types of the actions performed on the at least one object by the at least one user.” Independent claims 16, 31, and 46 include similar subject matter, among other things.

In contrast, Vivacqua describes a system in which only a single type of action is monitored, namely, the authoring of java source code files. Since the system of Vivacqua only accounts for a single type of action, Vivacqua does not disclose values associated with different types of actions (*e.g.*, authoring actions, response actions, linking actions, and editing actions), or determining a user affinity based in part on the values associated with the types of actions performed by a user. Further, the cited portions of Vivacqua do not disclose that the record of authors of various sections of Java code is maintained in meta data associated with the Java code. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 based on Vivacqua should be withdrawn. Further, claims 9, 13, 15, 24, 25, 28, 30, 39, 40, 43, 45, 54, 55, 58, and 60 depend from corresponding ones of claims 1, 16, 31, and 46, and therefore, are allowable over Vivacqua based on their dependency as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

Rejection based on “Newbold”

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9, 14-16, 24, 29-31, 39, 44-46, 54, 59, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087600 to Newbold (“Newbold”). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 to further clarify various aspects of the invention. Based in part on these amendments, as well as for features present in the independent claims prior to the amendments of this paper, Applicants traverse these rejections as being improper at least because Newbold does not disclose all of the features of the claimed invention.

For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “*maintaining a record of a number of times that actions are performed on the at least one object by the at least one user and a record of action types of the actions performed on the at least one object by the at least one user, wherein the types of the actions comprise an authoring action type, a response action type, a linking action type, and an editing action type, and wherein the record is maintained in meta data associated with the at least one object[, and] associating a value with each of the action*

types of the actions performed on the at least one object by the at least one user.”
Independent claims 16, 31, and 46 include similar subject matter, among other things.

While Newbold does disclose that the actions that a user performs on a document (e.g., filing, forwarding, deletion, *etc.*) can be used to determine a relationship between the user and the relationship, Newbold does not disclose assigning values to each of the action types, and then calculating a user affinity score to the document based on the actions the user has performed and the assigned values. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 based on Newbold should be withdrawn. Further, claims 9, 14, 15, 24, 29, 30, 39, 44, 45, 54, 59, and 60 depend from corresponding ones of claims 1, 16, 31, and 46. Therefore, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn at least based on their dependency as well as for the features that they recited individually.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 12, 26, 27, 41, 42, 56, and 57 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vivacqua in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,224 to Gilmour (“Gilmour”). Applicants disagree with this rejections at least because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention. For example, Gilmour does not cure the deficiencies of Vivacqua addressed above. For at least this reason the rejection of claims 11, 12, 26, 27, 41, 42, 56, and 57 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: May 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

 Reg. No. 47,429

for:

D. Benjamin Esplin
Registration No.: 58,297

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Phone: 703-905-2000
Fax: 703-905-2500